UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

To Whom Do We Pray? - *May Stranathan*

Words, Ideas, Things! - *Victor S. Yarros*

Infanticidium—*Fragment of a Platonic Dialogue*

No Other Hell - - *Edith Lovejoy Pierce*

Abolish the Whipping Evil - *David Lord*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXVI NUMBER 6

Chicago, November 18, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 83
Jottings—J. H. H. 86
ARTICLES—
To Whom Do We Pray?—MAY STRANATHAN 86
Words, Ideas, Things!—VICTOR S. YARROS 88
Infanticidium—Fragment of a Platonic Dialogue—Dialogi Personae: Socrates, Glaucon, Meletus 89
No Other Hell—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 91
Abolish the Whipping Evil—DAVID LORD 91
On the Pacifist Front—XXVI 93
POETRY—
Revolt—THOMAS CURTIS CLARK 87
How Long, How Long?—ROBERT WHITAKER 90
Today's Inferno—CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS 92
THE STUDY TABLE—
Judaism and Modern Society—JAMES M. YARD 94
The Biography of Biographies—C. A. HAWLEY 95
A Logical Proposal for Peace—WILLIAM FLOYD 95
"The Never Failing Stream"—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 95
THE FIELD—
An Appeal to the American People 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Appeal to the American People

(The following statement appeared recently under the signature of a number of New York and Brooklyn clergymen of various denominations. It was called forth by an earlier statement by a group of leading educators and ministers which in effect counselled against any expression of American public opinion in favor of provision for the millions threatened with starvation in Poland, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, unless the British government first expressed a willingness to allow such action.)

We, the undersigned, appeal to the American people on behalf of the most helpless victims of war in Europe. We find ourselves greatly disturbed by the endeavor of some distinguished Americans to turn public sentiment against what is known as the "Hoover Plan" for preventing or lessening starvation among the little democracies overrun by the German Armies. We agree with Mr. Hoover in believing that the statement recently issued by "a group of sincere citizens" does not aim to oppose "saving the lives of millions among these people."

But Mr. Hoover presents incontestable evidence that millions will starve unless Germany and England allow foodstuffs to be imported. Therefore, the opposition to the Hoover Plan in the absence of a different or a better plan decrees famine and death for the peoples of Holland, Belgium, Norway, and Poland. We are troubled because it appears that these critics of the Hoover Plan have no other plan. Nor does their statement reflect a full understanding of the exact nature of the "Hoover Proposal."

These stricken countries are pleading for some agreement by which, *with their own money and ships,* they may import foodstuffs from overseas with *"an international organization supervising the operation and protecting their supplies from the occupying armies."*

The proposal of the relief organizations for whom Mr. Hoover speaks, *involves an agreement from the Germans* to permit such imports under non-belligerent control; and further, to agree to take none of the domestic produce of these people, and to furnish the equivalent of any food already taken. The British on their part are to permit food ships under this authority to pass through the blockade. In trying to bring this about, Mr. Hoover is speaking for four recognized and responsible American organizations set up for the relief in Belgium, Norway, Holland, and Poland. They are headed respectively by Edgar Rickard, Hendrik van Loon, Johs. Westergaard, and Chauncey McCormick.

To those who believe that no such arrangement could be brought about there appears one simple answer. Where the lives of millions are at stake we must make the effort. To the fear that Germany might not keep such an agreement the answer is it

(*Continued on page* 96)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVI MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1940 No. 6

A PRAYER OF PEACE

Eternal God, Father of all souls,
Grant unto us such clear vision of the sin of war
That we may earnestly seek that coöperation between nations
Which alone can make war impossible.
As man by his inventions has made the whole world
Into one neighborhood,
Grant that he may, by his coöperations, make the whole world
Into one brotherhood.
Help us to break down all race prejudice.
Stay the greed of those who profit by war, and
The ambitions of those who seek an imperialistic conquest
Drenched in blood.
Guide all statesmen to see a just basis
For international action in the interests of peace.
Arouse in the whole body of the people an adventurous willingness;
As they sacrifice greatly for war,
So, also, for international good will;
So dare bravely, think wisely, decide resolutely,
As to achieve triumphantly.

Harry Emerson Fosdick.

ROOSEVELT!

President Roosevelt is unbeatable. His triumph on election day stands without parallel in the political history of this country. Other men have sought the continued support of their fellow citizens. Thus, Ulysses S. Grant desired a third term in the presidential office, but, for all his military prestige, was denied even a third nomination. Grover Cleveland ran three times for president, but was elected only twice. Theodore Roosevelt tried for a third term in 1912, and failed. But Franklin D. Roosevelt has swept into the presidency three successive times, and by majorities that are amazing. This time, as formerly, he defied all his critics and confounded all the prophets. We must believe that it was for his virtues, not his defects, that he was again elected by the people. Nobody voted for him because he was running for a third term, or because he had burdened the nation with an unprecedented debt, or because he had played disastrously with the economic problem without solving it. These things he was forgiven because of his humane sentiments, his progressive ideals, his solid legislative achievements endorsed by Mr. Willkie, and his ceaseless remembrance of the common man. If we did not think that this was the judgment of the people, and its motivation, we would despair of democracy. As it is, we must be frank and say that the reëlection of Mr. Roosevelt gives us no especial satisfaction. On the contrary, it fills us with profound concern, even alarm. With such a mandate as this, what fresh sensation will this brilliant but unstable man prepare for us? How many more experiments will he try on an economic system which he so obviously proposes not to reform but to retain? How long will it take him to carry us into this war which can alone feed his thirst for new power and greater renown? We are prepared for anything, while at the same time praying that this unprecedented success in this last election may quicken all the better instincts of Mr. Roosevelt's nature. If he is the great man his followers say he is, he will be humble and not proud in the face of his tremendous triumph. Arrogance and rancor will disappear, and a gracious magnanimity crown his years. Wisdom will take the place of impulse, and bring at last his dreams to some fruition. We find it difficult to associate these hopes with anything that we know of President Roosevelt. But no one will be happier than ourselves if we be confounded by the next four years. May God guard and guide this nation and its leader!

A UNITED PEOPLE

"On Wednesday, November 6, the American people will accept the verdict cheerfully and in a sporting spirit. All bitterness will disappear and whoever wins will have the loyal support of all Americans."

These words spoken by Fiorella H. La Guardia, the fighting Mayor of New York, two weeks before the close of the bitterest presidential campaign in many years, are a true prophecy. They confound, as their fulfilment has already confounded, the fearful forebodings of the hysteriots who deprecated a political campaign in this time of crisis, and even went so far as to plead for its suspension through the acceptance by the people of a non-partisan Roosevelt-Willkie ticket. These persons have no faith in democracy. Panic-mongers of the Walter Lippman and Dorothy Thompson type live day and night in terror of Hitler and all his works, since these works are all that they really believe in as forces of human destiny. They know no way of resisting and defeating the Nazi power save by duplicating this power on a greater and more terrible scale, and thus turning America into a Germany-plus. They understand no possible national unity except in terms of a regimentation of the people by authority from above which will end free thought, free

speech, open debate of controverted issues, political campaigns, and party rivalry. One political party, perfect obedience to the administration in Washington, conscription, armed preparedness on a vast scale, an aggressive foreign policy, defiance of all enemies, dictatorial rule—this is their idea of an America for these times. That such ideas constitute a betrayal of democracy which could spring only from a fundamental distrust of democracy, is obvious. Fanatics of the Lippman and Dorothy Thompson school are the worst enemies we have. Happily the people take no stock in them, and go their independent way. They nominate their candidates, contend furiously for their election, march by the millions to the polls, vote independently and freely, accept the result (victory for some and defeat for others), and then go happily about their business. Here is the only unity which is worth while in the life of a great people—the unity not of opinion nor of organization, but of spirit, purpose, and ideal. The presidential campaign had its unfortunate features; neither name-calling nor egg-throwing is an argument. But if ever democracy was vindicated, it was in these last few months. If ever the American people were strong it is today.

"Awake, our souls! away, our fears!
Let every trembling thought be gone!"

THE SUPREME WAR HORROR

Amid all the horrors of this war, nothing is quite so horrible as our bored acceptance of the news which daily brings us the stories of destruction, death, and doom. We are so satiated with it all that we hardly read the headlines any more. The most ghastly events hardly stir even a fleeting emotion. We see this fact, as though flashed upon a screen, when some unusual occurrence of the most insignificant character as contrasted with what is going on in Europe, takes place close at hand, and we suddenly get excited. Thus for weeks, a year or so ago, we hung breathless on the dispatches from Portsmouth, New Hampshire, telling of the sinking of the submarine *Squalus*. But in this war submarines are being sunk every week, and their crews go through all the dreadful agonies suffered by the crew of the *Squalus*—and we never turn a hair. Some weeks ago, the Hercules powder plant blew up in New Jersey, killing some forty or more employees. But explosions of this kind are occurring nightly in the streets of London, with women and children as the victims, and we take it in our stride. At the very time that this whole nation was excited by the kidnapping of one three-year-old child in California, an English transport was sunk in the Atlantic, and eighty-three children perished by drowning and exposure. And the kidnapping successfully held the headlines from the drowning. How can we thus become impervious to horror? Is it because the events at home are close at hand, while these others are far away? Yes, that has something to do with it. Most persons have no imagination. Is it because we get accustomed to what is going on all the time, and thus can be aroused only by the unexpected and the unusual? Yes, that's another part of the explanation, we have no doubt. The routine experience dulls the nerves and at last destroys the power of reaction. But the real explanation, we are convinced, lies elsewhere. It's *war* that makes the difference. We have been educated to regard war as virtuous; nay, more than virtuous—heroic! War, or at least *our* war, or the war of those with whom we sympathize, is sacred, and therefore sanctifies all it touches. The horror of an accident, or an occasional kidnapping, shocks us. But the infinitely greater horrors of war—these are sacrifices to be bravely offered and nobly borne! What is such an attitude of mind but war's supreme horror?

IN FOG AND DARKNESS

How often do we stop to think of how little we know these days of what is going on in the world? We have become so accustomed, here in America, to being informed about events in all parts of the world that we do not realize, except by a conscious effort of thought, that our admirable news services, while still intact themselves, no longer have access to the sources of information. These news services are like admirable water systems suddenly cut off from the reservoirs—or like electric light bulbs when the wires have been severed. Poland, for example, is a country of some thirty millions of inhabitants, which is absolutely shut off from communication with the rest of mankind. Nobody outside of official quarters in Berlin and Moscow knows what is going on there. Russia, which covers one-sixth of the entire globe, is a land of impenetrable darkness. Some weeks ago the New York *Times* closed the only individual newspaper office in the land of Stalin, and now there is nothing left but one or two of the great news-gathering agencies which can handle only the mimeographed sheets of misinformation handed out by the censor's office. Germany and Italy are much the same; it is pitiful to read the dispatches and listen to the radio talks from Berlin and Rome, and note how they are all merely rehashed versions of official releases of the respective governments. Norway, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, occupied France are almost as completely lost as Poland. Asia hangs like a vast fog-bank on the horizon; we know that tremendous events are happening there, but what are they? England and the Empire are of course more open, but here also the censor is day and night on the job. In this country, we have no censor—*yet!* But do we know what is going on? Only as echoes and flashes occasionally escape from the official smokescreen of Washington. We are enough of a democrat to believe

that the people have a right to know what their government is doing, and to be consulted through their representatives about matters of grave public policy, especially as affecting foreign affairs. But this is not the idea of the Roosevelt administration, which is well-nigh as sufficient unto itself as Hitler's Reich. Which brings us back to where we started—in the dark gloom of ignorance!

FIFTH COLUMN STORIES

In every war there has to be something outrageous and horrible to get excited about. In the last war, it was atrocity stories. Those of us who lived during that war will remember the ghastly deeds alleged to have been done by the German soldiers in invaded countries. Women's breasts cut off, children's hands chopped off, nuns violated, civilians shot, Canadian soldiers crucified, dead bodies boiled down for fats—the variety of these reports was endless. Newspapers were full of them. Correspondents described them in vivid detail. Great and trusted men made official investigations and confirmed the horrors—as witness the report of Belgian atrocities signed by Viscount Bryce. Not to believe these tales was to stamp oneself as a pro-German and a traitor. Yet now we know they were not true! There were atrocities in the war, of course—atrocities committed by both sides, more by Germans than by other troops, since Germans were the ones occupying foreign territory as conquerors. War breeds atrocities, and is itself the supreme atrocity. But the great mass of the hideous tales were lies, and some of them deliberately invented by the French and English. In this war, for some reason, atrocity stories are not flourishing. Perhaps we are so used to Jewish persecutions, concentration camp tortures, and refugee agonies, that our minds are impervious to the impact of these stories. But there is a substitute at hand, and a good one—namely, the Fifth Column stories now pouring down upon us like a flood. It's the atrocity stories experience all over again, only this time it is not German soldiers perpetrating horrors unmentionable but German spies perpetrating plots incredible. Once again the most circumstantial yarns are being told. Newspapers and serious magazines, reporters, correspondents and radio commentators, are all outdoing one another in broadcasting hair-raising details of the Nazi conspirators who surround us. Investigators, official and otherwise, sent out to get the facts, have exactly the experience of the atrocity investigators of a quarter of a century ago. They find precisely what they are looking for! That the whole thing is a repetition—with different material, but the same technique—of what we went through in the last war, will all be disclosed in due course. We are being fooled again by the warmongers who know why they want to fool us, and how to do it successfully. But meanwhile, the public mind is being ravaged as by a disease. And woe be unto the man who, having immunized his mind by a little common sense, refuses to believe and to become terrorized! Today as yesterday one is a pro-German just to the extent that one is still a reasonable being. Who was it who said that the first war casualty is truth?

A DESPERATE OUTLOOK

President Robert M. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, has declared that "American universities are the last resource of a world plunging to destruction." Is this true? If so, the plight of the world is more desperate even than we had imagined. For what are these same American universities doing in this distressful hour? Why, doing their utmost to plunge America into that very pit of destruction digged by the European war. All over this country the colleges and universities are seething with war excitement. The professors and many of the presidents have gone mad in the business of warmongering. Without the slightest authorization of trustees or overseers, with no consultation with faculties or students, these institutions have been taken right into the war and are doing their utmost to carry the nation with them. "To the forces of brutality, chaos, and ignorance," says President Hutchins, "the university opposes the power of righteousness, order, and knowledge." Does it? We don't know about Chicago, but such universities as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton have already undertaken to oppose "the forces of brutality, chaos, and ignorance," not with "righteousness, order, and knowledge" at all, but with precisely these same forces which they pretend to abominate. In other words, they want to go to war, and match Hitler's "brutality" with a more ruthless and thus more terrible "brutality" of their own. President Hutchins states that the good life, as America understands it, "is impossible without freedom of action and freedom of thought." Very good! But how much freedom of either thought or action is President Butler going to tolerate in his University of Columbia? "Modern dictators," says Hutchins, "have shown they cannot tolerate a university" dedicated to "knowing the truth and doing justice." But how long would such universities be tolerated in America in wartimes, and how many such universities are there? The fact of the matter is that our American institutions of learning, under the drive of super-patriotic presidents and hectic professors, are now being regimented to the business of war, exactly as German and Italian universities were regimented by the dictators. The process has not yet gone by any means so far, but in essence it is the same thing. Read *The Mortal Storm* (or see it in the movie!) if you would understand what is going on at Columbia. President Hutchins seems to be of a different kidney. We hope he is!

Jottings

SAVING AMERICA FROM HITLER! "The United States may have to adopt some of the methods of Nazi Germany to build its defenses with the strength and speed contemplated under the new armament program. We will have to organize the whole country, and we may have to copy Hitler in some respects."—Dr. R. E. Doherty, President of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, quoted in the *Christian Science Monitor.*

The success of German bombers in destroying England is matched only by the success of English bombers in destroying Germany—according to official communiqués on opposite sides. One wonders, with such destruction wrought by each side on the other, that the war is still going on.

Maury Maverick wants us to return to the days of his forefathers who went into Texas "with a bottle of whiskey in one hand, a gun in the other, and a prayer on their lips." What does a prayer count for in such company? Why be a hypocrite in addition to being a drunkard and a brigand?

Under Italian bombing attacks in Palestine, Jews and Arabs seek out air-raid shelters together, and cooperate actively and amiably in defense. If Martians should attack this planet tomorrow, Germans and English would straightway forget their quarrels, and join in repelling the invasion of this planetary foe. What a grand thing it would be if Orson Welles came true!

Where did Hitler get all the planes that made him so superior to all other nations in the air-arm so vital to modern warfare? Are German factories so much more productive than all others? Note this, from a United States Senate report:

> It is apparent that American aviation companies did their part to assist Germany's air armament. Also, that there was not an adequate check on the foreign shipments of these companies by the appropriate branches of the government—the War and Navy Departments. The first six months of 1933 the sales figures to Germany took a tremendous jump to $1,445,000.

And the jump went right on by leaps and bounds!

Hitler blackmailed Petain and Laval into coöperation with the Reich by threatening to starve the people of conquered France. Might it not be well, all things considered, for America to feed those people on the basis of the Hoover plan?

To Whom Do We Pray?

MAY STRANATHAN

One evening several women, gathered in the public library of a small town, were reading the life of Mahatma Gandhi. His biographer spoke of his devout life and that of his mother, saying the latter went every day into the temple to pray.

"But to whom do they pray?" asked one of the women, born and reared in the Presbyterian faith. No one seemed able to answer her. One woman said she had heard a missionary state that if Gandhi could be converted it would be the greatest triumph for Christianity since the conversion of Saul of Tarsus.

Roger Babson, in a recent article warning of the menace of Japan, refers to the situation between Japan and America as a "poker game," but adds that if war must come it would be better for us that it should come now before the "entire axis group is ready to put the screws on us." He says in conclusion:

> On the other hand it seems as if, with all these nations worshipping the same God, there should be some way to settle these great problems without resorting to war. Some time Britain, Germany, and Japan must sit around a conference table and settle things. Why not do it now?

Japan has recently taken measures to bring the Christian missions more and more under the control and restrictions of the state, and Mr. Kagawa has been arrested. We have been told that Germany has repudiated Christianity in favor of the martial virtues of the old Norse gods. So if these nations mentioned by Mr. Babson are all praying to the same God to give them the victory, it must be embarrassing to the Almighty to make a choice between them.

Russia is not mentioned by Mr. Babson as one of the nations to sit around the peace table of his hopes. It is generally referred to as a "Godless nation," one which has broken the Kellogg-Briand peace pact—the pact it was the first of the great powers to ratify! But it should not be forgotten that out of Russia, both before and after it renounced Christianity, have come proposals for peace. Maxim Litvinov, the former Russian Secretary for Foreign Affairs, set before the League of Nations in 1927, a proposal for complete and simultaneous disarmament. In *Harper's* of May, 1928, Albert J. Nock says:

> This of course would not end war. Litvinov never pretended that it would. Plenty of people have gone to war armed with slings and arrows, and they could do so again. They could go to war armed with flatirons and hoe handles for that matter. But it would be a substantial expression of the much advertised desire for peace, and a considerable guaranty of good faith; and Litvinov represents, it is said, the second largest army in Europe. Was his proposal discussed? It was not. One newspaper, which makes dubious pretentions to editorial character, said, "The Russian proposal reeks with hypocrisy. . . . Litvinov was obviously playing a game."

Mr. Nock goes on to say:

> If one can be so sure of Litvinov as all that, and is really concerned to make other people equally sure, why not rap for a showdown on his little bluff? This is as convincing a procedure as it is in draw poker. Merely by blackguarding the Russian proposal butters no parsnips; showing them up would butter all the parsnips there are.

Time, of last July 15, says of this same proposal:

> Having embarked upon the collective security method of pursuing her objective of peace, Russia gave it all she had. Litvinov became one of the most strictly consistent delegates to the League, repeatedly astounding his colleagues with the proposal that everybody disarm. But almost from the time she entered the League, Russia saw the principle of collective security sold out time after time. . . . In 1938 Russia proposed a joint *demarché* of Great Britain, France, and the U. S. S. R., to protect Czechoslovakia, offering to carry out "to the letter" her guaranty to France and Czechoslovakia. Munich followed. In 1939, after Germany took the rest of Czechoslovakia, Russia proposed a six-power conference to devise resistance to further aggression. Great Britain said the proposal was "premature." A month later proposed an ironclad three power alliance with Britain and France. Nothing happened for three weeks, then Litvinov resigned. . . . It was not Litvinov but collective security that fell. In her objective Russia has been so consistent she makes the democracies, and even the Fascist powers, look like wishful wobblers.

Litvinov was not the first Russian to propose peace measures to other nations. The St. Petersburg *Court Gazette,* of December 30, 1800, contained the following item:

> His Majesty, the Emperor, perceiving that the European powers cannot come to an accommodation, and wishing to put an end to a war which has raged for fourteen years, has conceived the idea of appointing a place to which he will invite the other potentates to engage together with himself in single combat on lists which shall be marked out, for which purpose they shall bring with them to act as their esquires, umpires, and heralds, their most enlightened ministers and able generals.

The Emperor Paul, author of this scheme, was called mad—not for this alone but for other actions as well. His son, Alexander I, also cherished a dream of world peace and was the originator of the Holy Alliance, fated to be wrecked upon the rocks of imperialism.

It may well puzzle the reader of the "religious news" to determine how the Catholic Church can explain to the Prince of Peace the division of allegiance of those who profess to worship him. In *Time* of August 19 last, it is stated that Cardinal Hinsley, a Catholic leader in Britain, went on the air to preach a holy war against the Nazis, declaring the aviators and sailors, to whom he would give personally blessed crucifixes, to be "on the side of the angels in the struggle against rebellious Lucifer." In the meantime the Italian Bishop of Terracina, according to the same publication, exhorted his flock thus:

> We ought most fervently to address our prayers to the God of Hosts that he may deign to bless the officers and soldiers and crown their sacrifice and heroism with complete victory. We should particularly pray for the return of the Holy places and especially the Holy Sepulchre and the Cenacle, which will receive the veneration due them only when the flag of Catholic and Fascist Italy flies above them.

Into such a state of confusion and cross purposes does war bring religion. It is not alone the Catholic Church that is grasping at the two horns of the dilemma. The attempt to link Christianity and Democracy as the Siamese Twins of civilization has failed. As the *Commonweal* puts it:

> The church cannot, obviously, choose for states a temporal form of government to support or condemn; . . . . the relation of the church to the dictator states has to be carried to some tolerable solution. The relation of the dictatorships to non-dictator nations like our own, has to be solved.

In regard to this statement, and indeed, in regard to the whole situation, the reader might well ponder these words of Ben Ray Edman:

> For my part, I have never understood how, if the truths of any religion were really true, there could be any place in the world for secular leadership or government. Down to date, however, there seem to remain a few doubts and dissensions regarding dogma.

In these schizophrenic days even the preachers seem to have split personalities and are asking, along with the rest of us, "If we fight, what are we fighting for? To preserve Christianity and Democracy? Oh, where can these be found?" Are we willing to fight to preserve the imperialism of England in the hope that it may protect us from the forces of Fascism and Communism? This universal confusion was expressed recently by the Reverend Dilworth Lupton of the First Unitarian Church of Cleveland thus:

> Like millions of other Americans I find a fierce debate going on inside my mind. It seems to be a conflict between my reason and my conscience. My reason says, "Don't advocate war. Why get into the European mess? It is the last thing that England wants in spite of what Mr. Brailsford says. Those English people are a tricky lot. One day they seem to take their foreign policy out of the New Testament, the next day from Machiavelli's Prince. If America stays out she can bind up the wounds of the world when it is over." [This is the view of H. G. Wells, expressed in a recent interview.] But my conscience speaks up. It is our war the British are fighting. We here in America seem ready to defend freedom and democracy to the last Englishman. What kind of sportsmanship is that? It sounds too much like the rationalizings of the Priest and the Levite to suit me.

In his essay on "Intellect," Emerson says:

> I shall not presume to interfere in the old politics of the skies. "The cherubim know most; the seraphim love most." But I cannot recite, even thus rudely, the laws of the intellect without remembering that lofty and sequestered class who have been its prophets and oracles, the high priesthood of pure reason, the Trismegisti, the expounders of thought from age to age. When, at long intervals, we turn to their abstruse pages, wonderful seems the calm and grand air of those few, those great spiritual lords who have walked in the world—those of the old religion—dwelling in a worship which makes the sanctities of Christianity look parvenu and popular. For "persuasion is in soul, but necessity in intellect."

Revolt

Take down your bloody banners, War,
  And cease your battle cries;
Your dreams are not worth fighting for,
  Your songs are brazen lies.

Too long have nations sought your word,
  In councils suppliant:
You answered with the fiery sword,
  With curses jubilant.

Too long have churchmen hymned your praise;
  How faithful have we been
To follow you through bitter days—
  Our great and fateful sin!

But now we know you as you are,
  So let your boastings cease;
We fight beneath a fairer star,
  The star of love and peace.

Take down your bloody banners, War;
  At last have we grown wise—
Your dreams are not worth fighting for,
  Your songs are brazen lies.

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

Words, Ideas, Things!

VICTOR S. YARROS

Why do men fight, what do they fight over or about, and what can we do to cure them of their suicidal and insensate habits?

In the last few years quite a number of writers who call themselves scientific thinkers have proclaimed the startling discovery that what humanity needs for its salvation is Semantics, a developed science of language. We have been told that we fight over words; that we do not try to understand one another and waste time and energy and paper on disputes and polemics that have no real meaning, and that if we but learned to use words intelligently and precisely, a thousand sources of friction and discord would dry up as by magic, and life would become serene and pleasant.

What a simple and easy solution for our terrible problems! But, alas, the alleged solution is too simple, too superficial. There is *some* truth in Semantics, but the truth is not new, and what is new is quackery and humbug.

It is true—and Socrates, Plato and Aristotle pointed it out long ago—that many of our controversies are futile because we do not start by determining the issues with all possible exactitude and carefully defining *our* terms. It is certainly not true that *all* disagreements would melt away if we took pains to formulate our issues with precision and settled in advance the meaning of all the terms we intended to use in our discussion.

Men *have* fought over words, but, as Byron said, words are things, and not mere symbols. Words express and body forth ideas, and ideas are weapons. Ideas inspire, stimulate, inflame, because they summarize and represent vital experience, good and evil.

Men have fought over food, territory, power. Men have fought because they were full of hatred and lust and mad ambition. Today, for example, stubborn and arrogant employers fight collective bargaining not because they object to the *phrase,* but because they fear and dislike labor unions and labor "agitators," and because they believe that unionism is a menace to profit and to autocratic control over industry. Men denounce the New Deal not because the phrase offends their ears, but because it stands for a formidable list of measures and policies which curb speculation, shackle anti-social cunning, prevent larceny in business, feed the poor, and employ the involuntarily idle.

There are ideas behind these measures and policies—the idea that we are members of one another; that private monopoly is dangerous and vicious; that social control is a condition of social justice, and that the let-alone philosophy of the classical school of economics is dead and buried.

No science of language, however developed and perfected, would solve our economic, political, and social problems, or our international problems, or the problems caused by race prejudice and color prejudice.

The professors and popularizers of Semantics claim too much for their pseudo-science, for another reason. They forget that, as Whitehead reminds us, language, though a tool, is woefully inadequate as such beyond a limited sphere. The demand of Professor Bridgman and others for "operational" use of language is proper and reasonable in the fields cultivated by the physical sciences. Words can and should be used operationally in chemistry, physics, biology, and physiology. They should be used operationally in jurisprudence and criminology. But in poetry and imaginative literature generally words cannot be so used, and the demand for such use spells incredible ignorance of the value and function of letters and the fine arts generally. Metaphor, parable, imagery, may not be operational, but without them literature is unthinkable. Moreover, there are intuitions and thoughts which cannot be fully clothed in operational words. They can only be vaguely, haltingly indicated.

Finally, there are words which express what the French call general ideas. Such words are far from being "meaningless"; but we have the right to demand of those who use them illustrations, examples, reductions to concrete statements.

The writer was invited some time ago to debate the subject "Capitalism *vs.* Socialism" before a very intelligent group. He accepted, and explained that he would argue that Capitalism was bankrupt, sick unto death of inherent contradictions, and certain to be superseded by some form of Socialism. Several men were asked to defend Capitalism, but two of these declined on "semantic" grounds. They declared that there was no such thing as Capitalism, and the word was without definite meaning. The offer to substitute for the term Capitalism the phrase, "the present economic system," was rejected for the same semantic reason—there was no capitalist "system," *strictly* speaking, they said.

These objections serve to bring into relief the basic fallacy of Semantics. The demand for absolute precision was foolish. We all know that what is called Capitalism is an order of things distinguished by several salient traits: the profit motive, private enterprise, freedom of contract, dislike of government interference with business processes, and the like. On the other hand, Socialism, as advocated for more than a century by able and persuasive thinkers, contemplates a very different order of things: public ownership, the elimination of the profit motive, social control of production. There was thus plenty of scope for useful debate. The rigorous semanticists were not clarifying thought; they were confusing it. Their preciosity is as ridiculous as that which Moliere killed in France by his famous farce.

Here is another instance of intellectual confusion. Stuart Chase, an enthusiastic convert to Semantics, among other alleged examples of the "meaningless" use of words by most poor mortals, cited this one: "A man says, I don't like Harvard, and imagines he has made a statement of some sort." To Semantics, however, the phrase meant nothing. It was not operational.

In truth, the man made a perfectly clear and significant statement. To be sure, he did not tell us *why* he did not like Harvard, but that is a very different point. We are entitled in such a case to what lawyers refer to as a bill of particulars. If I am charged with criminal libel, I am entitled to specifications. When and where and how did I utter the alleged criminal libel? But the charge itself is in no sense meaningless.

As a matter of fact, we know that certain groups do not like Harvard, and we know why. Some think Harvard is too atheistic or too agnostic, because it has unbelievers or infidels on its faculty. Some say Har-

vard has too many aggressive and undesirable Jews in its student body. Others believe that Harvard is too conceited and snobbish. One who has never heard of Semantics will understand that he would be justified in asking the man who said he did not like Harvard to give the reason or reasons for his antipathy toward Harvard.

Man is a generalizing animal, and an animal who fashions symbols, indulges in what we know as poetic license and highly colored and figurative language. Who would have him otherwise? There is a time for drastic brevity, a time for rigorous exactitude, and a time for exaggeration and extravagance, for ornament and picturesqueness in speech. Prophets, orators, and exhorters cannot be expected to use language in a purely operational way. When they call men "worms," we know what they mean.

The world will not be saved by pedantry disguised as Semantics. It will be saved by righteousness, justice, good will, and the scientific spirit applied to problems which remain unsolved because too many of us are blind, selfish, hate-filled, and cowardly.

Infanticidium*

Fragment of a Platonic Dialogue

DIALOGI PERSONAE: SOCRATES, GLAUCON, MELETUS

Glaucon: Have you heard, O Socrates, of the many atrocities lately committed by the Lacedaemonians in raiding the frontiers of Attica and slaughtering helpless little children in our villages?

Socrates: With the greatest grief I have heard of these shameful deeds, O Glaucon.

Glaucon: You have heard also, I suppose, how the citizens are crying out for retribution and demanding that we use the little children of the Lacedaemonians in the same way as they have used ours?

Socrates: This, too, I have heard.

Glaucon: And to me, indeed, the demand appears perfectly just. But tell me, O Socrates, what is your opinion?

Socrates: I scarcely know what my opinion is, Glaucon, not having carefully considered the matter.

Meletus: It should not need much consideration, Socrates; not, at least, if you have any sense of justice.

Socrates: It may be that I have little or none, Meletus. But you, I am sure, have a great deal. Tell me, then, concerning this same justice, what are its proper functions?

Meletus: In seeing that right is done between man and man, and that criminals are made to pay the penalty of their crimes.

Socrates: That is very well answered, as it seems to me, Meletus. And the Lacedaemonians, you say, are criminals?

Meletus: Most certainly. For what can be more criminal than to slaughter helpless little children?

Socrates: I for my part can conceive nothing more criminal; and I agree that those guilty monsters should be made to pay the penalty.

Meletus: Then it appears to me that I have already convinced you, Socrates, and that nothing further remains to be said.

Socrates: Perhaps you are right, Meletus. Yet before we finally exact punishment from such criminals, is it not first necessary to determine exactly who the criminals are?

Meletus: But that has already been determined, Socrates, and by your own admission that they are no other than the Lacedaemonians.

Socrates: All the Lacedaemonians, Meletus? For you will not say, I think, that all the inhabitants of Lacedaemonia invaded our frontiers and took a hand in slaughtering our children.

Meletus: This is mere chicanery, Socrates.

Socrates: In what way, Meletus?

Meletus: I mean that there is no distinction in guilt between those who actually slaughtered our children and the whole Lacedaemonian people who sent them.

Socrates: Were these murderers, then, not sent by the Ephors? Or have I been misinformed as to this?

Meletus: The Ephors gave the word, I daresay; but the voice of the Lacedaemonian people instigated them.

Socrates: Of the whole Lacedaemonian people?

Meletus: Certainly—of the whole Lacedaemonian people.

Socrates: Then you give me some very new and interesting information, Meletus.

Meletus: Of what information do you speak?

Socrates: Of the information that in Lacedaemonia not only have all the men a voice in the government of their State, but all the women, also and even all the children down to infants, I suppose, of one day.

Meletus: You misrepresent my words in the most ridiculous manner, Socrates. I never said anything so foolish.

Socrates: It was my obtuseness, no doubt, that misunderstood you, O Meletus. And I was wrong, it seems, in concluding that the children of the Lacedaemonians instigated the slaughter of our children?

Meletus: Most absurdly wrong.

Socrates: Then I confess I am in a difficulty, Meletus.

Meletus: In what difficulty?

Socrates: In a difficulty to discover how these children of the Lacedaemonians are guilty of a crime which they neither committed nor instigated.

Meletus: I, for my part, did not say that the children of the Lacedaemonians were guilty.

*Published in the *Manchester Guardian* during the World War of 1914-1918.—*Editor.*

Socrates: But we agreed, I think, that it was the function of justice to exact retribution from the guilty?

Meletus: Certainly we did.

Socrates: Then, as it appears to me at least—but perhaps I speak foolishly—it is not the function of justice to exact retribution from the children of the Lacedaemonians.

Meletus: This is your old trick, Socrates, of most unscrupulously twisting a man's words against himself; so that really it seems useless to argue with you. But, leaving justice for the moment out of the case, I have another argument for slaughtering the children of the Lacedaemonians, which even you, I believe, will find it hard either to distort or evade.

Socrates: It rejoices me to hear this, Meletus, having no love for the Lacedaemonians, either themselves or their children.

Meletus: Well, then, I affirm that, by slaughtering the children of the Lacedaemonians, we shall deter them in future from slaughtering our children.

Socrates: Tell me, Meletus, what you mean exactly by "deterring" them.

Meletus: I mean that when they find that as surely as they send and slaughter our children, so surely we send back and slaughter theirs, for the sake of their own children these murderous brutes will very quickly desist.

Socrates: A fancy comes to my mind, Meletus. Shall I tell you what it is?

Meletus: By all means.

Socrates: I picture to myself some murderous brute coming round and cutting the throat of your eldest child. In which case, on your principle, you would, I suppose, instantly go round and cut the throat of his eldest child.

Meletus: Most certainly I would.

Socrates: To what end?

Meletus: To the end that, having learnt in person the grief of having his own child's throat cut, he should learn from the future not to cut the throats of any more of my children.

Socrates: Say, my friend, which is the more likely to be grieved by the death of his eldest child—the decent, kindly father, such as you are, or this murderous brute of a father whom we have just described?

Meletus: I suppose the decent, kindly father.

Socrates: You suppose rightly; and in return, for the grief that this murderous brute had caused you, you would inflict on him, as it seems to me, no corresponding grief. For you would sorrow most pitifully for your murdered child, but he, being the brute he is, would sorrow for his very little, or perhaps not at all. Nay, is it not even more likely, Meletus, that, so far from being grieved, and thereby deterred, he would rather be angered into coming round and burning your second child in its bed? And would you not be committed, on your principle, to going round and burning his second child in its bed? Or would you shrink from that?

Meletus: I would not shrink even from that, Socrates.

Socrates: But what if this murderous brute, being still not in the least grieved, but only further incensed, should come round yet again, and having hacked slices of flesh from your child while still alive, should devour these dripping slices before your eyes, would you, Meletus, go round and devour his third child while still alive, before his eyes in the same way?

Meletus: This is too horrible, Socrates. Nevertheless, I would find some way or other of dealing with his third child.

Socrates: But would this be any longer to use his child in the same way as he had used yours?

Meletus: Perhaps not, Socrates. But I would go as near to it as any man, not being a brute and a cannibal, could.

Socrates: Then it looks, Meletus, as if this murderous brute had an invincible advantage of you. For there is a point of atrocity at which your decent good nature must stop, but there is no point of atrocity at which his brutal ill nature will ever stop or so it seems to me.

Glaucon: And to me also, Socrates.

Socrates: Wherefore, I am of opinion, Glaucon, that our friend Meletus here will have embarked on this contest of atrocities in vain, having done nothing to deter his brutal antagonist's brutality any more than when he began, and having sullied his hands with the blood of several innocent children in the meanwhile. And so, I believe, it will be with us in the same way if we embark on a contest of child-slaying with the Lacedaemonians. Or do you still believe otherwise, Meletus?

Meletus: I believe now what I have often heard said of you, Socrates, that you are in truth a pro-Lacedaemonian.

(*Flings away in a rage*)

Socrates: Meletus seems to be aggrieved with me, O Glaucon, that he is a decent, kindly man. Yet it was not I, but the gods who made him so. Moreover, I have no care at all for the Lacedaemonians. But I have a great care for the good name of my fellow-citizens.

How Long, How Long?

O warring world, when will this madness cease?
These loyalties that more disloyal are,
That men must love the near, and hate the far,
Provincial slaves; as when the Isles of Greece
Crashed all their cultures, sold their Golden Fleece
To foul their glories in the muck of war,
Their lettered lore of centuries, to mar
The world's academies with scorn of peace.
When will the sun walk unashamed on high?
Nor any Empire claim its ceaseless gaze?
Nor any land shall ask its sons to die
Seeking the world's proud capitals to raze?
Ask not the gods, but when shall we deny
Insanities that more and more amaze?

ROBERT WHITAKER.

No Other Hell

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

Sometimes, when the war seems particularly oppressive, I find myself thinking: "We really are in Hell, only we don't know it. This *is* Hell. There is no Hell beyond this." Some such feeling sweeps over me when I read of kindly, intelligent people, among them well-known churchmen, arguing against the lifting of a blockade that bids fair to starve the helpless war victims of many nationalities of Europe. Shocked and dismayed I try to grasp the incredible. How can such a thing be? These are good people, not bad people—only they don't understand, they lack imagination. . . . I fumble for the break in the circuit of rationality of minds so apparently paradoxical.

Perhaps these people are not parents. Or perhaps they are all elderly and their children have grown up and left them. They have no *small* children any more. My own nine-year-old daughter sits at table with me every evening. There is food in the icebox and in the store around the corner. *But what if there weren't?* Mary's little face is white and pensive. She has no appetite; she should eat more. What if she had been, after all, the European child she came so near to being? I myself was an English child in England during the last war. I remember my mother saying in front of me that there was food enough for only three weeks. I remember it to this day.

This is Chicago, so it is all right, but it might as easily have been Paris, Brussels, or any one of a hundred other cities. Mary's name might have been Colette, Gretchen, or any one of a hundred other names. What throw of a cosmic dice decreed that I should be here—that this should be Chicago?

Some one has said that Jesus never saw crowds, but always saw faces. In this age of generalities, mass movements, abstract theories, we are in danger of becoming blind to faces and seeing only crowds. What principle, however noble, what idealism, however exalted, could possibly justify the starving of children because it is "necessary"?

Caiaphas made a very impressive speech, which no doubt he was proud of, when he declared that one man should die for the people, that the whole nation perish not. To reverse his stand out of last-minute pity would have been as awkward and undignified for Caiaphas as it would be for some of our own prominent citizens. After all, it was only one man. One man against the common good.

For a moment let us imagine that we are in 1950 instead of in 1940. Ten years ago in Europe millions died like flies; pestilence, originating in that hot-spot of decay, spread to other continents and decimated the population of the globe. The hunger-maddened hordes of continental Europe, their reason perverted by suffering, have embraced Fascism as their only salvation and are feverishly preparing to rise up and fall upon the English-speaking peoples who have been represented to them as the source of all their troubles. Children with minds and bodies distorted by starvation are growing to adolescence—soldiers for the Third World War. "Civilization" has been geared to hatred. Life finds its major fulfilment in death.

But in England and in America some people are suffering even worse torture. Their standard of living has gone down, but they are not starving. Nor has the threatened millstone mentioned by Jesus been tied around their necks. Only they are remembering. Remembering something they said years ago about tightening a blockade. *They cannot forget.* And this is *really* Hell. There is no Hell beyond this.

Abolish the Whipping Evil

DAVID LORD

An examination of our present legal codes reveals clearly that children who certainly form the weakest, most defenseless section of society, still lack effective laws for their protection against physical punishment and assault. Public opinion, unfortunately, regards the brutal whipping of children by their parents and guardians with singular apathy, and apparently remains unaware of the fact that this same practice of bodily punishment is responsible for a large number of the cases of actual murder of minors reported in the press.

There is only one cure for the whipping evil, and that is by striking at the very root of the practice by placing a law on the statute books prohibiting the whipping of a minor child for any reason whatever. It seems incredible that our present civilization, which has abolished the lash and the torture-chamber for adults, should still allow these survivals of the medieval world to linger on in private homes and institutions devoted to the care of children. It seems incredible that children, whose very weakness makes them the prey of sadists parading as parents and guardians, should lack laws guaranteeing them the same right of life and limb that an adult has in the face of physical assault.

The physical weakness of children is responsible for the whipping evil: let us make no mistake about that. And the researches of modern psychology have revealed clearly the actual nature of the adult who indulges in cruelty to children.

Human nature at its worst: that is what we see when we turn the spotlight on this particular aspect of the parent-child relationship. A person of brutal tendencies—and there are many of that type in the world, let us make no mistake about that either—finds it difficult to pursue his bent in the world of adult relations; the laws curb him at every turn. Under this circumstance, it is merely natural for his innate brutality to seek satisfaction on the bodies of his offspring, who because of their physical weakness and economic dependence and lack of legal protection against bodily violence, are unable to defend themselves.

The present period is one of general loosening and degeneration of social bonds. Marriage is no longer the institution that it was. Social chaos and the prevalence of divorce have deprived a large number of our children of that essential right of children: a home. These conditions, which work to bring children under the control of step-parents, create a hell for the child, a hell in which the devil is some unprincipled adult of vicious

tendencies whose excessive brutality frequently causes the death of the child.

It might be argued that the above is an extreme statement of the case, that such rare exceptions as are portrayed here should not be accepted as typical of the prevailing condition. Let us face the facts: mistreatment of children—mistreatment resulting in permanent bodily injury, irremediable psychic damage, and death—is a widespread phenomenon of our time. For every case which reaches the papers there are a thousand others that no one ever hears about. These are the cases which take place in our own towns, our own neighborhoods—the cases of whipping and torture and aggravated brutality which we regard apathetically as being in the natural order of things and never make any effort to prevent.

The defenders of the whipping practice are without any sound basis for defense. That whipping has any educative value whatever is now denied in all competent quarters. The only thing that can be said of the practice is that it panders to the brutal instincts of the perpetrator and allows people of the wrong type to impose their arbitrary will on the child.

Any approach to the matter must take into consideration these two salient factors: the physical weakness of the child and the inadequacy of the law. A woman can secure a divorce from her husband on the grounds of cruelty, but a child cannot secure a divorce from his parents for the same reason. An adult can seek and secure redress for the various degrees of assault and battery, but a child has no recourse against a parent or legal guardian who habitually abuses him to a degree exceeding assault and battery as defined by law. Adults are guaranteed protection of life and limb by the courts, and in their domestic and civil relations are usually protected from bodily assault by their position as adults, which in the last analysis is a condition of physical size. The child, on the other hand, because of his position as a child, which is also a condition of physical size, attracts the brutality and ill-treatment which, because of his physical weakness, he is powerless to prevent.

The punishment of children in the schools is now being stopped to a certain degree by the growing tendency of parents to seek redress in the courts. These suits, however, are assault cases filed against third parties, and result from the desire of the parents to protect their own offspring. They offer no defense to the child whose problem is essentially one of the home relationship.

There is only one answer to the problem: the abolition of the whipping evil by legal means. Present laws are inadequate for the purpose; there is no law on the books to prevent the whipping of a child by his parent or guardian. Therefore, the law which would meet the emergency would not only prohibit the whipping or mistreatment of a minor child for any reason whatever, but would provide a suitable penalty for violation. Only by the passage of such a law can the child be given the benefits of civilization now enjoyed by adults.

It might be argued that whipping, when properly administered, is a sound corrective for the wayward child as well as a builder of character. To those who argue in this vein, it should be pointed out that whipping, because of its very nature as a barbaric survival from the past, can never be properly administered, that it can do the child no good, and that it frequently does irreparable damage.

Whipping, indeed, is a practice which defeats its own purpose. Fear of punishment teaches a child to lie and deal falsely with his parents. There is no possibility of building character—and that should be the aim of every parent—by appealing to the negative qualities in human nature. Foremost among these qualities is fear, and punishment is nothing but an appeal to fear. The path of intimidation and brutality leads only to the ruin of irreplaceable psychic values.

The world needs kindness more than it needs anything else. One need not be a prophet or a visionary to realize that the problems of the world can never be solved until real, genuine kindness and brotherly love become the law of nations. Kindness cannot be taught children with the whip, nor can any society claim to be a just one so long as its weakest members lack the protection of adequate laws.

Every state in the Union should be required to pass a law prohibiting the whipping or bodily punishment of minor children. Such a law would prevent the murder of the many children who will die in the coming years because of whipping and other cruelties to the body, and would prevent the terrible suffering undergone by hundreds of thousands of other children who now find themselves in the power of depraved cruelists parading as parents and guardians.

Our society cannot lay claim to any true code of humanity until children as a class are emancipated from the threat and practice of bodily punishment and torture. The only way in which this can be achieved is by the passage of strong laws providing adequate penalties for the practice. There is no task more noble, more worthy of a truly humane man or woman, than the emancipation of youth from the more brutal aspects of our racial heritage.

Let us abolish the whipping evil. When we have done so, we will realize that we have abolished not only whipping but a great part of the cruelty and brutality that prevent our present civilization from being what it should be.

Today's Inferno

If Dante were on earth today,
  This current "year of grace,"
He would not have to travel down
  And search that evil place
Where men are punished for their sins,
  And Hell's consuming flame
Torments the soul, but never ends
  The humbled sinner's shame.

For he would find his Hell on earth,
  Where—swept by war's hot breeze—
The long and tragic roads of doom
  Are thronged with refugees,
And souls less happy than the dead
  Are moved to vengeful hate.
What story of more lurid scene
  Could Dante now relate?

CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XXVI

The New York *Times* publishes the following cable dispatch from Bombay, India:

The Government of India replied today to the All India Congress campaign against the ban on preaching pacifism by arresting Vinoba Bhane, one of the two men nominated by Mohandas K. Gandhi to defy the authorities.

Vinoba made three pacifist speeches in villages near Wardha during last week and it was announced that he would speak at another village about ten miles from Wardha.

In accordance with Mr. Gandhi's project for passive resistance, confined at the start to individuals, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Vinoba openly invited arrest by advertising their intention to speak. Mr. Gandhi, to whom the Congress Working Committee has entrusted the leadership of campaign, has apparently decided to stay out of jail so as to make sure that civil disobedience does not spread and does not take on the form of a mass movement, which is contrary to his present plans.

A later dispatch to the *Times* from New Delhi reports the following:

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, former president of the Indian Congress party, was arrested near Allahabad this evening after a meeting with Mohandas K. Gandhi.

He was one of two men chosen by Mr. Gandhi to make anti-war speeches as a part of the plan of limited civil disobedience. Vinoba Bhane, the other nominee, was arrested a few days ago after making a series of pacifist speeches in defiance of the government's ban on anti-war activity.

Pandit Nehru was arrested under the Defense of India Rules, charged with delivering an objectionable speech at Gorakhpur recently.

A still later dispatch reports that Pandit Nehru has been sentenced to prison for four years.

The New York *Times* publishes the following special dispatch from Albany, N. Y.:

The Presbyterian Synod of New York adopted a committee report today which said that "all Christians ought totally to reject war."

In our last column was reported the arrest in Boston of the Reverend Keith C. Kanaga, associate minister of the Mount Vernon Church, for refusing as a pacifist to register. A sequel to this event is found in the following special dispatch in the New York *Herald-Tribune:*

BOSTON—The first community reaction against the extreme pacifism of the Reverend Keith C. Kanaga, of the Mount Vernon Church, was the discharge of his wife, Mrs. Sarah M. Kanaga, from her position as secretary to a Boston surgeon, it was learned tonight.

Mr. Kanaga, who, with the Reverend Harry H. Kruener, pastor of the First Baptist Church, was indicted last week for refusing to register for selective service, conducted his usual Bible class and supervised the young people's meeting today. Whether the congregation of the church where he is assistant pastor will take action on his failure to comply with the draft law probably will be decided tomorrow night at a meeting of the standing committee.

While there was disapproval of Mr. Kanaga's pacifism among those at the services, there was likewise indignation that his wife should be an innocent victim.

A local Cleveland (Ohio) newspaper publishes the following report:

The Cleveland Ministerial Association called on the government to "exhaust all the possibilities of peace," before committing America to participation in the present world struggle, in a resolution adopted yesterday at Euclid Avenue Baptist Church.

An Associated Press dispatch from Vatican City runs as follows:

A usually reliable Vatican source said today that Pope Pius plans a descent in a torchlight procession to blacked-out St. Peter's basilica on the night of November 24 and there to pray for peace.

This source said the holy father would be carried on his portable throne and accompanied by the noble guards and all the cardinals in Rome through the vast dark basilica, now unlighted because of the war, to the confessional altar above the tomb.

There he will pray for one hour and read a special prayer for world peace. The occasion will serve to emphasize the pope's standing order that in convents, sanctuaries, and churches throughout the world peace prayers be constantly offered up, it was said.

An Associated Press dispatch from Washington, D. C., reports the following:

Representatives of 20 organizations to keep this country out of war discussed at an "emergency peace conference" today plans for united action.

The conference was called by O. K. Armstrong of Springfield, Missouri, a member of the American Legion. In an address he said he was acting as an individual and declared:

"We are interested in an urgent and vital task—to discover the forces that are at work seeking to break down the neutrality of our people and to drag our nation into wars with our neighbors in Europe or the Far East; to analyze those forces; to expose and combat them with all our intelligence and vigor."

An Associated Press dispatch from Elizabeth, New Jersey, announces the following:

A complaint charging the Reverend S. F. Blamberg, Jr., 32-year-old pastor of the First Congregational Church, with refusal to register for the draft, has been filed with the United States Attorney's office at Trenton.

C. McK. Whittemore, chairman of Union County Draft Board, No. 7, filed the complaint. He said Mr. Blamberg had been summoned before the board for failure to register October 16 and that when he appeared the clergyman answered all questions, but refused to sign registration cards.

Mr. Blamberg, interpreting his action as "an incomplete registration and not a categorical refusal to register," said "its incompleteness is caused by what to me is a problem that is real and serious from the Christian standpoint but not insoluble."

The Philadelphia correspondent of the *Christian Century* reports the following:

A. J. Muste, secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, told the Philadelphia branch, convened at Pendle Hill: "We urge young men, faced with conscription, to think through the implications of their decision, to be true to conscience and to the will of God, as it is given to them to see; prepared, if necessary, to suffer legal or economic penalties for such fidelity to conscience. All of us will support conscientious objectors, give them spiritual sympathy and seek to provide material aid for their dependents in case of need. Nonpacifists, who believe in the American principle that the state may not coerce the conscience, ought to give moral support to conscientious objectors."

The following report from the recent Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was published in the *Christian Century:*

Dr. William Eddy, president of Hobart College, gave a strong address to the Woman's Auxiliary on the cross being above the flag. It was resented by professional patrioteers,

but deserved national attention. "I shall be entitled to vote for intervention," he said, "when I am ready to turn over half my salary and offer my son as a sacrifice. I tremble for the soul of America if we meddle with this terrible tragedy on the ground that it will increase our curve of production. Another performance like that, a war to make millionaires, and our churches had better close up because America will be irretrievably damned. The flag represents a good interest which stops at a national frontier, whereas the cross represents the interests of the Creator and Preserver of mankind, interests which were not discovered in 1492 but which go round the globe and down the endless arches of the milky way."

Advisory Boards for conscientious objectors under the draft are being organized in various parts of the country. The latest to be reported, in the columns of the *Christian Century,* are a Board in Minneapolis set up by the Ministers Association; another in Tulsa, Oklahoma, set up by the Ministerial Alliance, and a third in Seattle, set up by the local "Keep America Out of War Congress."

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has issued an important pamphlet on "The Conscientious Objector and the Selective Training and Service Act." Copies may be obtained at the Council's headquarters, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

The Reverend Winslow Wilson, minister of the Brownsdale and Dexter Methodist churches in Minneapolis refused to register under the Conscription Act. Mr. Wilson's churches, according to the *Christian Century,* have asked him to resign, "but it is reported that they may reconsider."

The Cleveland correspondent of the *Christian Century* reports that on Registration Day (October 16th last), forty-three Cleveland clergymen signed a call to "a service of penitence" for the failure of religious leadership to prevent the conditions which have brought about the national Conscription Act. The one-hour service was led by the Reverend Edwin McNeill Poteat, and was attended by more than one hundred persons.

The Study Table

Judaism and Modern Society

CONTRIBUTIONS OF JUDAISM AND MODERN SOCIETY. *Pamphlet by Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman. Cincinnati, Ohio: The Tract Commission, Merchants Building.*

Valuable pamphlets are often overlooked merely because they are pamphlets. This is a case in point.

Rabbi Feldman has written a very valuable document which should be read by gentile as well as Jew. The only acquaintance that most Christians have with Judaism is through the Old Testament. Most of us know very little of modern Judaism. For that reason this pamphlet is of great value.

This essay deals not with the contributions of the Jew but with the contributions of Judaism. There is a distinction. Judaism is the contribution of the Jews but Jews have contributed to modern society much more than Judaism. For example, Jews have contributed to science, art, invention, etc. Dr. Feldman is writing about the contributions which may be ascribed to Judaism. In other words, it is the spiritual and ethical contributions of the Jew that are here dealt with.

We should all be more aware than we are that Judaism has contributed to the whole world our God concept. This belief in a unique, holy, and ethical God has colored the thinking attitudes of the whole modern world. The moral codes which have come to us from ancient and modern Judaism have become part of the very fibre of what is desirable and hopeful and promising in modern society.

Dr. Feldman is quite right when he says:

> Whatever modern society may achieve in the field of social justice and social progress is largely the result of the Jewish God concept at work in the hearts and souls of men. There are Jews who are crass and materialistic and reactionary but no Jew has yet dared to justify his crassness or reactionary attitude by the words and teachings of the prophets and rabbis of Israel.

Our conception of the spiritual dignity of man which is expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Bill of Rights comes right out of Judaism. The idea of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man which is the very heart of any true democracy comes straight from Judaism. That is to say, the concept of democracy in America is the political counterpart of the religious idea of the Brotherhood of Man.

Anyone who will study the early documents of American history from the days of the Plymouth Colony in 1636 down through the speeches of men like Ezra Stiles, President of Yale College, or the sermons by many New England preachers, will discover that American political ideals were profoundly influenced by the Bible of Judaism.

Dr. Feldman has a most interesting section of his essay called "Spiritual Democracy—the Right To Be Different." Quite contrary to the idea that many people have about the "chosen people," the Talmud teaches that "the pious of all nations have a share in the life to come." This certainly runs counter to modern totalitarianism whether religious or political. It acknowledges the existence of many paths by which man may find his way to God—many avenues of salvation.

It could easily be proved that our passion for education in the United States is another contribution of Judaism. The men who founded our educational system were deeply read in the Old Testament. They were well aware of the emphasis that Judaism has always placed upon learning. They were aware that one of the ancient teachers of Israel said, "No ignoramus can be pious." It is also a fact that as early as the First Century, schools were erected in every town throughout Israel. Education was considered a matter of public concern and responsibility. Even when Europe was steeped in deepest illiteracy, there was hardly any illiteracy in Jewish communities.

Americans still believe in education for every child. This pamphlet will render a real service if it makes us aware that the Jews contributed this passion for learning to the United States.

Finally the idea of the Kingdom of God which is so much a part of the modern social gospel is a Jewish conception. As Rabbi Feldman says:

> This Kingdom of God concept is an exaltedly hopeful one.

It sets a goal for life and gives purpose to history. It posits the perfectibility of the human race. It gives worth to human endeavor. It gives value to ideals and courage to idealists.

Young people especially would find much for discussion in this valuable pamphlet.

JAMES M. YARD.

The Biography of Biographies

THE SEARCH FOR THE REAL JESUS: A CENTURY OF HISTORICAL STUDY. *By Chester Charlton McCown. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.* 338 *pp.* $2.50.

This is another volume in the International Library of Christian Knowledge, and it also was chosen by the Religious Book Club. The manner in which biographies of Jesus came to be written is, in itself, an entrancing subject. When one thinks of the relatively late date of the coming of objective biographies, it often comes as a surprise that Chaucer had no biography of Jesus in his library, nor did Dante. Harmonies of the Gospels preceded biographies by several centuries. Finally after the archaeologists, the travelers, the crusaders, and others had put their knowledge into common use, the rise of criticism brought forth the objective biography of Jesus. The current philosophies also had their part in producing lives of Jesus, and one of the important contributions of this book is the large amount of space given to this aspect of the matter.

This book should receive a cordial reception not only from students of the New Testament, but also from the general public, since as the author correctly points out "the 'search for the real Jesus' began amid the reactionary confusions of the post-Napoleonic period. This account of it ends in the midst of the very similar, but much more seriously reactionary confusions of another postwar period that has suddenly dropped over the precipice into war once more." It is the teaching of Jesus that was supposed to save the world from such a recurrence. Perhaps the next cycle in the study of the life of Jesus will be able to save civilization. This book may suggest the way.

C. A. HAWLEY.

A Logical Proposal for Peace

PERMANENT PEACE. *By William C. Brewer. Philadelphia: Dorrance & Company.* $2.50.

Out of a cloudy sky, from the city of brotherly love, shot from the rifle of a soldier, comes a proposal for peace that deserves the attention of every peace-lover.

This book does not make a religious appeal for prayers to God or the Prince of Peace without whose aid man can do nothing. It is not a sentimental approach to pacifism by one who has practised non-resistance all his life. It is not an indefinite plea for internationalism that might arouse the Carnegie Foundation or any other belligerent peace organization that wants to subdue by force the particular aggressor of the moment before making plans for peace. It is a logical proposal for permanent peace that will benefit all peoples, including those in the totalitarian countries.

This is the suggestion of a lawyer who fought as a soldier during the World War and now applies his legal mind to the overthrow of his military profession. Lawyer Brewer shows that international law as it exists today is merely custom with no provisions for enforcement. "It is little more than a code of international ethics, or the courtesy nations are expected or supposed to recognize as binding in their relations and intercourse." Soldier Brewer advises total disarmament. "Purely destructive implements such as artillery, warships, submarines and bombing planes would exist nowhere, except the few necessary for the use of the World Alliance."

This World Alliance is to include all the nations of the world. Dr. Brewer has prepared a Constitution based on the Constitution of the United States, that has worked well for 150 years, and has formulated an international Constitution whose fifty Articles provide as never before a definite form of organization that could function as soon as agreed upon.

The World Alliance government is to consist of legislative, executive, and judicial branches, with a bicameral World Congress, the Assembly to be composed of representatives of all countries based upon population.

That the author of this Constitution for a World Alliance views the subject more rationally and idealistically than many a person who has been long identified with the peace movement is shown by the following paragraph:

> It is not necessary for either side to be definitely defeated in this conflict. A negotiated peace would be better than a fight to the finish, when both sides would be starved and exhausted and feeling would be so bitter that it would be hard to effect an equitable compromise. There are two sides to the controversy and each side is partly right and partly wrong. A decisive military victory for either side would not establish justice in Europe, nor in the world. The best solution is to stop the conflict now; adjust the differences of the combatants, and establish a new world order which would give equality, liberty, justice and permanent peace to every nation on earth.

WILLIAM FLOYD.

"The Never Failing Stream"

THE NEVER FAILING STREAM. *By Maurice N. Eisendrath. Toronto, Canada: The Macmillan Company.* 398 *pp.*

Here in a book of sermons by Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath of Toronto, Canada, we have striking exemplification of the riddle that is the Jew—especially in his national relationships. Rabbi Eisendrath is an American-born rabbi working and preaching in Canada. Your reviewer is an English-born rabbi working and preaching in America. If there be a bias at all, it would be in favor of the author of these sermons in that your reviewer is thoroughly alive to the problems of expatriation.

The volume has an introduction by Phyllis Bottome, distinguished authoress of *The Mortal Storm,* which is felicitous and assuredly a splendid tribute to the Rabbi's influence upon contemporary Canadian life.

There follows the author's introduction, of singular charm and modesty, which in your reviewer's opinion is belied by the dogmatism of much that follows.

The sermons cover a wide range, but it is not unfair to say that, with only one exception, they are of the type conventional with the modern reform rabbi in the Sunday sermon—i.e., concerned primarily with the current topic.

Judged from this angle, it does not seem that Rabbi Eisendrath has anything to say that would be very violently controverted by any of his colleagues in the liberal Jewish ministry, nor anything that might mitigate the criticism—even today—of our orthodox brethren.

An unusual command of the English language must be conceded to the preacher—as well as marked ability in its use. For the rest there is a restatement of "orthodox reform" sentiment dated about three decades since.

Take a liberal dose of "ethical humanism," mix a little good-natured satire upon religious ceremonial, and add a dash of chauvinism (negatively expressed as anti-Zionism) and you have the recipe.

The trouble is that, writing or speaking in 1940, all these controversies are as dead as a doornail.

There are eighteen addresses of which some were delivered on the "Forum of the Air." Titles include "Where Jew and Christian Meet," "Canada First," "Fit for a King," "Who Is the Chosen People?" "Nation, Race, or Religion," "Swastika or Crucifix," "The Never Failing Stream," et al.

The address on "Pulpit and Politics" makes a plea for participation of the minister in political controversy. There is considerable validity in this plea, although it fails adequately to discuss the danger of the intrusion of party politics—whether in Canada or the United States of America—which is a grave and, by no means, academic aspect of this problem.

"Who Is the Chosen People?" presents the viewpoint of Israel as chosen for sorrow and spiritual leadership, as opposed to Hitler's doctrine of Aryan domination—in an entirely orthodox fashion judged by the standard of reform philosophy.

"Nation, Race, or Religion" presents ably the Jewish reform viewpoint and is wholly acceptable provided you agree with the point of view. No new argument *pro* or *con* is advanced. It is as justifiable for a Toronto rabbi to present this argument to a Toronto audience as it is for any American rabbi to present it to an American congregation, but its dogmatism is as vulnerable in either geographical setting.

"Why Are Jews Persecuted?" is a moving presentation, eloquent and valid, of what Dr. Stephen S. Wise once summed up in one deathless sentence: "The Christlessness of Christianity."

Lest this necessarily brief resumé of these sermons be judged as unfavorable, your reviewer asks for space to discuss two more of them. Of one, "World without Jews," it must be said that there is an irenic and genuine emotional appreciation that must have thrilled the listening audience. It is a presentation of the preacher's oratorical ability at its highest.

One halts with admiration, almost amounting to awe, before the spiritual exaltation of the final sermon—that which gives the title to the book, "The Never Failing Stream." Frankly, this address seems to be the only real sermon, in the stricter interpretation of the term, in the series, and it would suggest that the preacher is at his best, in his rightful milieu, i.e., as a standard bearer of the traditional ethical, spiritual, and intellectual ideals of his people.

This is a sermon preached on the Jewish New Year, and is permeated with that eternal optimism which so largely accounts for the survival of the Jew—through all the vicissitudes of his chequered career. In its restatement of the "undying voice of true religion which so softly and yet so sternly enjoins": "Let Justice flow forth as water and righteousness as a never failing stream," this sermon reaches a rhapsodic height that fittingly closes the volume and transcends the controversial, dogmatic and ephemeral that precede it.

Your reviewer would ask what is Eisendrath saying today, not in terms of a largely outmoded humanism of twenty to thirty years ago, but in the capacity of a preacher in Israel in 1940?

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

has done so before. There is nothing of which we are more proud than the manner in which we ourselves fed the Belgians during the German Occupation in the last war. The Nazis have kept such an agreement in regard to Poland during the present war. Moreover, the American Friends Service Committee, which has dealt with three German regimes, including the Nazis, reports that it has never had an agreement broken by the Germans in the matter of relief work. Furthermore, the British hold the whip-hand. If Germany does not keep the agreement, the ships can be stopped on an hour's notice. And that would be the bulk of the imports. Moreover, there could be only one or two weeks' accumulation of food in these countries at any given time, and that would be a mere bagatelle to the Germans even if they were disposed to seize this supply.

Aside from these considerations we are disturbed by the widespread interpretation that the signers of this warning against the "Hoover Relief Plan" are quite willing to use the starvation of millions in the little democracies as a weapon against Hitler. They state that American security is deeply involved in a British victory. The implication, therefore, is that the blockade against the little overrun democracies must be kept up for American security. We cannot believe that the American people wish to strengthen their security at such a price.

The general tone of their appeal, together with the reference to the British attitude as an example, suggests a willingness, reluctant though it may be, to accept the sufferings of helpless people in these conquered nations on the theory that if enough people starve and die, out of their unspeakable anguish, there will come revolts of desperation which may mean Hitler's downfall.

Aside from considerations of humanity this seems to us like short-sighted and wishful thinking. Long before the misery and degradation would be sufficient to provide desperation for a revolt in disarmed and starving peoples, disease culminating in the dread typhus will have ravaged these peoples and scattered its poison around the world. If revolution should break out, it would be led by the most desperate and bitter of men. Who knows that then their fury would not be directed against civilization itself, or what remains of civilization, more than against the German conquerors.

Finally, and above all, we are troubled by the religious and ethical implications involved in these things. A thousand times we have read or heard read, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him." We recognize that nations may follow no such precept. But we are dismayed and grieved when eminent leaders of the church and education appear willing to let innocent non-belligerents starve because to let them live might "strengthen the enemies of democracy."

J. Henry Carpenter, Secretary,
Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation.
Allan Knight Chalmers,
Broadway Tabernacle, New York.
Phillips Packer Elliott,
First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.
John Haynes Holmes,
The Community Church, New York.
John Paul Jones,
Union Church of Bay Ridge, Brooklyn.
John Howland Lathrop,
Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn.
Martin Paul Luther,
New Utrecht Reformed Church, Brooklyn.
Elmore McKee,
St. George's Episcopal Church, New York.
A. J. Muste, Secretary,
Fellowship of Reconciliation.
Henry Neumann, Leader,
Brooklyn Ethical Culture Society.
John Nevin Sayre, Editor of *Fellowship*, Secretary, International Fellowship of Reconciliation.
Ralph W. Sockman,
Christ Church, New York.
Frederick K. Stamm,
Clinton Avenue Congregational Church, Brooklyn.